

1 THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 STATE OF WASHINGTON, *et al.*,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 DONALD TRUMP, *et al.*,

14 Defendants.

15 CASE NO. C25-0127-JCC

16 ORDER

17 This matter comes before the Court on the Individual Plaintiffs' emergency motion to lift  
18 the Court's stay and for an expedited briefing schedule seeking class certification (Dkt. No. 138).  
19 The movants assert that lifting the stay is appropriate because there has been a "stark change in  
20 circumstances." (*Id.* at 2) (citing *Canady v. Erbe Elektromedizin GmbH*, 271 F. Supp. 2d 64, 74  
21 (D.D.C. 2002)). Namely, the Supreme Court's ruling in *Trump v. CASA, Inc.*, --- S. Ct. ---, No.  
22 24A884, 2025 WL 1773631 (U.S. June 27, 2025). (*See id.*)

23 A district court has broad discretion to stay a proceeding, incidental to the inherent power  
24 to control its own docket. *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 706 (1997) (citing *Landis v. N. Am.*  
25 *Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936)). This power includes staying an action "pending resolution of

1 independent proceedings which bear upon the case.” *Mediterranean Enters., Inc. v. Ssangyong*  
 2 *Corp.*, 708 F.2d 1458, 1465 (9th Cir. 1983).<sup>1</sup>

3 On June 27, 2025, the Supreme Court issued a ruling that this and other district courts’  
 4 nationwide preliminary injunctions “likely exceed the equitable authority that Congress has  
 5 granted to federal courts.” *CASA*, 2025 WL 1773631, slip op. at 4 (U.S. 2025). It then stayed the  
 6 preliminary injunctions “to the extent that the injunctions are broader than necessary to provide  
 7 complete relief to each plaintiff with standing to sue.” *Id.* at 15. Notably, the Supreme Court did  
 8 not reach the question of whether the injunctions are, in fact, broader than necessary; instead, it  
 9 remanded the cases to their respective lower courts and instructed the lower courts to “move  
 10 expeditiously to ensure that, with respect to each plaintiff, the injunctions comport with this rule  
 11 and otherwise comply with principles of equity.” *Id.* Now, as the Individual Plaintiffs see it,  
 12 “mov[ing] expeditiously” would include lifting this Court’s stay and setting an expedited  
 13 briefing schedule for class certification. (See Dkt. No. 138 at 3.)

14 Defendants oppose. (Dkt. No. 140.) They argue that lifting the stay is unwarranted  
 15 because their appeal is still pending with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and this Court  
 16 “STAY[ED] this matter . . . pending the outcome of Defendants’ appeal.” (Dkt. No. 118 at 2.)  
 17 They further submit that lifting the stay would be inappropriate because the Ninth Circuit has  
 18 already begun the task of determining whether this Court’s preliminary injunction is broader than  
 19 necessary to provide complete relief to each plaintiff with standing to sue; thus, the Ninth  
 20 Circuit’s ruling could very well render class certification moot. (See Dkt. No. 140 at 4–5) (see  
 21 also Dkt. No. 139) (Ninth Circuit’s order for supplemental briefing in light of the *CASA* ruling).

---

22

23 <sup>1</sup> Furthermore, in deciding whether to lift or maintain the stay, the Court considers the following  
 24 factors: (1) “the possible damage which may result from the granting of a stay,” (2) “the hardship  
 25 or inequity which a party may suffer in being required to go forward,” and (3) “the orderly  
 26 course of justice measured in terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and  
 questions of law which could be expected to result from a stay.” *Lockyer v. Mirant Corp.*, 398  
 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2005).

1 The Court agrees. Put simply, it would be premature for this Court to lift its stay when the Ninth  
2 Circuit has already moved expeditiously to determine the scope of the preliminary injunction. To  
3 that end, maintaining the stay would also promote judicial efficiency, judicial comity, and the  
4 overall effort to simplify the issues.

5 Accordingly, the Court DENIES the emergency motion to lift the Court's stay (Dkt. No.  
6 138). The Individual Plaintiffs may renew their motion once the Ninth Circuit issues its rulings.

7 It is so ORDERED this 3rd day of July 2025.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26



John C. Coughenour  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE